

REMARKS

Claim 80 has been cancelled and claims 1 and 30 have been amended herein. Claims 81-89 have been added.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 9, 10, 11, 15 and 28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Brown et al. (US 6,185,823). Claim 29 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Brown. Claims 3, 5, 7, 8 and 12 have been rejected as unpatentable over Brown in view of Anderson, claims 13, 14, 16-21, 30 and 33-43 have been rejected as unpatentable over these references further in view of Parmley, claims 22-24 and 31 have been rejected as unpatentable over all of these references further in view of Rozenkranc, and claim 80 has been rejected as unpatentable over Brown, Parmley and Rozenkranc. Applicants will address these rejections as they apply to independent claims 1 and 30. Applicants respectfully submit that the remaining claims are patentable for at least the reason that they depend from a patentable base claim.

Applicants' claims 1 and 30 both recite, *inter alia*, one or more shaving blades, and a trimming blade assembly. Claims 1 and 30 have been amended to clarify that the trimming blade assembly comprises a blade carrier and a trimming blade, as discussed in the last paragraph on page 12 of Applicants' specification.

The Examiner contends that Brown discloses "one or more shaving blades ... (seen in figure 14)" and "a trimming assembly (the blades 15 in figure 15 are a trimming blade assembly)." The blades "seen in figure 14" are in fact the same blades (blades 15) that the Examiner identifies as the trimming blade assembly. Thus, the Examiner is "double counting" the blades 15 as two distinct elements of Applicants' claim – the shaving blades and the trimming assembly. This is not a proper basis for rejection. Applicants' shaving blades and trimming blade assembly are two conceptually separate elements and cannot simply be merged into one element.

The Examiner also asserts that "the 'shaving surface' of figure 12 is a cutting region." Applicants disagree. The 'shaving surface' that is labeled in figure 12 of Brown is described, at col. 6, lines 27-31, as a reference plane ("a plane P, which is the 'shaving surface' tangential to

the skin contact surfaces immediately in front of and behind the blades"). This reference plane clearly cannot properly be construed as the "one or more blades having cutting edges arranged to define a cutting region" recited in Applicants' claims.

Anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires the presence in a single prior art disclosure of *each and every element* of a claimed invention. See, e.g., Verdegaal Bros., Inc. v. Union Oil Co., 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed.Cir.1987); Carella v. Starlight Archery, 804 F.2d 135, 138, 231 USPQ 644, 646 (Fed.Cir.), modified on reh'd, 1 USPQ 2d 1209 (Fed.Cir.1986); Jamesbury Corp. v. Litton Indus. Prods., Inc., 756 F.2d 1556, 1560, 225 USPQ 253, 256 (Fed.Cir.1985); Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., 730 F.2d 1452, 1458, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed.Cir.1984); Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 722 F.2d 1542, 1548, 220 USPQ 193, 198 (Fed.Cir.1983). Because Brown does not disclose each and every element of Applicants' claims 1 and 30, Brown cannot anticipate these claims.

Nor do any of the secondary references provide a teaching or suggestion that would have led the artisan to modify the razor disclosed by Brown to reach Applicants' claimed invention.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections under §§102 and 103 be withdrawn.

Applicants have not addressed each and every position taken by the Examiner, for example statements made regarding the secondary references that are presently moot; this does not indicate that the Applicants concede these points. Applicants reserve the right to address such issues during further prosecution.

Please charge the fee for excess claims, as well as any other charges or credits, to deposit account 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 00216-656001.

Applicant : Vincent P. Walker et al
Serial No. : 16/799,946
Filed : March 11, 2004
Page : 11 of 11

Attorney's Docket No.: 00216-656001 / Z-03359,
formerly Case #126

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 14, 2006

/Celia H. Leber/
Celia H. Leber
Reg. No. 33,524

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

21406639.doc